

## REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected the claims as unpatentable over Pettrash (EP 1086980) in view of Dart (GB 1231683) in that it would have been obvious to employ the chlorination step of Dart to change the surface characteristics of the Pettrash glove so that lubricants would not adhere to them, and to prechlorinate the latex coated forms/formers suggested by the combination of Pettrash and Dart to reduce the handling steps needed to make the gloves.

Applicants urge the Examiner to the conclusion that the claims are not obvious in view of these references on the following reasoning. Applicants' process occurs completely on the form/former. The Examiner has admitted that Pettrash fails to teach chlorination of the glove while on the former. Dart strips the glove from the former before applying an anti-friction powder and before tumbling the glove to remove dust from the halogenated surface (see page 1, lines 55 to 67, and claim 1). Thus, neither the Dart nor the Pettrash process is performed completely on the former. Applicants' claims in contrast recite that the last step in their process is "removing the finished glove from the former". A wholly on-line/on-former process, such as applicants' process, is more efficient than that disclosed in the cited art. Moreover, applicants' process is a powder free process for producing gloves, while the Dart process requires powder. In brief, the combination of Pettrash and Dart lead to a process that is not entirely performed on the former and that requires powder. For these reasons, applicants assert that their process is not obvious in light of the cited art, and respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejections and pass this case to issue.

end of remarks